## REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 have been amended. Dependent claims 27-30 have been added Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0086295 ("Cunningham"). Cunningham discloses a method of transmitting asynchronous hypertext messages from a server to a client interconnected by an internet. The method includes transmitting an HTTP request identifying the client to the server and initiating a virtual connection from the client to the server. The server then transmits a HTTP header signifying a large HTML document, thereby "fooling" a client web browser into keeping the HTTP port open. Asynchronous hypertext messages encoded into HTML documents may then be transferred from the server to the client. The transferred data may then be viewed in a web browser.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network. Independent claim 12 is directed to a system for providing security to a client computing system operating a browser in communication with an interactive software application maintained by a host computing system. Independent claim 19 is directed to a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an interactive software application. Independent claim 26 is directed to a system for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network.

6

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 in an effort to clarify two features common to each independent claim: (1) a communication between an interactive software application and at least one element that is located *outside the browser* <u>and</u> *on the client side of the client side firewall*; and (2) that the communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element occurs: (a) *after* the loading and/or storing of the interactive software application; and (b) *occurs exclusively on the client side of the client side firewall.* Applicant respectfully submits that each of amended claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 distinguishes over Cunningham.

The Examiner asserts that the feature of a communication between an interactive software application and at least one element that is *outside the browser* <u>and</u> *on the client side of the client side firewall* is taught by Cunningham. However, in the Examiner-cited paragraphs, Cunningham discloses a client JAVA applet receiving data from a server and the JAVA applet then formatting the data to display the message/information in a browser window. The data referred to is a message encoded in an HTML document that the client requests and receives (paragraph 0050). Likewise, paragraphs 0010-0013 of Cunningham disclose HTML information being transmitted over the internet and received by a client. Throughout this process of communicating HTML files, the JAVA applet of Cunningham is relying on the web browser security sandbox for security, and therefore, in contrast to amended independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, communicates *exclusively within the web browser.*

In contrast to Cunningham, the above-described features of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 describe the ability of the interactive software application to securely communicate with at least one element outside the web browser. The claim language mandates a manner of communication that entails a secure communication with *something* <u>outside</u> the web browser.

7

Because the at least one element as claimed is outside of the web browser, there can be no reliance on the web browser security sandbox for security protection. Applicant respectfully submits that, unlike claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, Cunningham discloses communication inside the web browser. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 be withdrawn.

Applicant additionally submits that Cunningham fails to teach or suggest communication between an interactive software application and at least one element occurs *after* loading and/or storing of the interactive software application and *exclusively on the client side of the client side firewall*. The Examiner cites well-known methods of manipulating common firewall-blocking techniques and Cunningham as teaching this feature, despite the fact that, for the reasons stated below, both these techniques and Cunningham *necessitate passing through a firewall*. Applicant respectfully submits that, although independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 prior to their amendment herein stated that the firewall is not penetrated during the communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element, in an effort further clarify the claims, claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 have now been amended to recite that *the at least one element is on the client side of the client side firewall* and that the communication *occurs exclusively on the client side of the client side firewall*. To eliminate any potential misconception that this communication is referring to the initial loading or storing of the interactive software application, claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 have further been amended to state that the communication referred to occurs <u>*after*</u> *the loading of the interactive software application*.

In contrast to the invention as claimed in amended claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, with any of the techniques cited by the Examiner , the firewall is being *manipulated* to allow communication between something on the client side of a firewall *with something <u>on the server side</u> of a*

*firewall.* Despite the fact that these techniques avoid being blocked by firewalls, the goal and the result of such techniques is for data to end up on the *opposite* side of the firewall. Cunningham is merely another permutation of a manipulation technique. Cunningham discloses communicating hypertext messages by manipulating the HTTP port in order to transmit a message through a firewall, while keeping the port between a server and a client open for real-time messages by "fooling" the web browser into believing a large HTML file is being transferred. Towards that end, messages are encoded into HTML files. Because the communication utilizes the HTTP port, firewalls by default permit the messages to penetrate the firewall. As result, the messages end up on the *opposite* side of the firewall.

In contrast, in the invention claimed in claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, the at least one element and the interactive software application, once loaded, are both on the client side of the client side firewall. The communication between the at least one element and the interactive software application occurs exclusively *on the client side of the client side firewall.* In the communication of the invention of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, *nothing* ends up on the *opposite* side of the client side firewall. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 distinguish over Cunningham. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-11 and new dependent claim 27 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-11 and 27 distinguish over Cunningham. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-11 is respectfully requested.

9

Dependent claims 13, 15-18, and new dependent claim 28 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 13, 15-18, and 28 distinguish over Cunningham and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 13 and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20-22, 24-25, and new dependent claim 30 depend from and further restrict independent claim 19 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 19, dependent claims 20-22, 24-25, and 30 distinguish over Cunningham and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25is respectfully requested.

New dependent claim 30 depends from and further restricts independent claim 26 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 26, new dependent claim 30 distinguishes over Cunningham and is in condition for allowance.

In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ross T. Robinson
Registration No.: 47,031
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
    CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant

10